



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

DELIVERED ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1913, AT CAM-
BRIDGE, MASS., AT THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

BY ALEXANDER R. HOHLFELD

LIGHT FROM GOETHE ON OUR PROBLEMS

Many of you, I am inclined to think, may be wondering why I should have chosen Goethe as a guide in considering some of the professional problems of the modern language men of this country. Let me assure you that the selection is neither accidental, nor meant to be facetious.

In the majority of the presidential addresses delivered before this Association, in its Eastern as well as in its Western branch, it has been customary for the speaker to present his case from a frankly personal point of view. Indeed, a deliverance like this, if it is to measure up at all to rightful expectations, must needs partake of the nature of a confession of faith. Emotions, to be sure, should not take the place of argument. But argument should be of such a character as to reveal those fundamental aspects of personality that lie beyond the reach of ready and conscious adjustment.

Whatever opinion of Goethe you may therefore have, individually and collectively, I think I had better admit from the outset that with advancing years I have constantly grown in admiration and in reverence for him of whom even Emerson could finally say, "The old Eternal Genius

who built this world has confided more to this man than to any other." More and more I have developed such a sense of dependence on Goethe for counsel and courage, for light and leading that, even though I tried, I could not keep it from asserting itself whenever on broad questions of principle I am to express my deeper personal convictions. It would not matter whether Goethean influence were specifically referred to or not in the title chosen for this address. It would inevitably be present; even as biblical standards would necessarily have determined the attitude of the early Puritan settlers here in New England on any large problem of culture or education.

To reassure you, however, I can truthfully say that my admiration is not blind. Nor is it ignorant of all that the most determined *advocatus diaboli* could urge against the canonization of my saint. On the contrary, favorite investigations of my own and of my pupils have brought me into unusually close contact with most of the adverse opinions concerning Goethe that have been voiced by German and by foreign writers. But I am more willing than ever to endorse the sentiment of a recent biographer, whose words, to be sure, have immediate reference to the German people:

Whenever a solar eclipse has threatened the orbits of our nation's public affairs or cultural life, we have invoked Goethe as the helper and bringer of light, and never yet in vain.

And on further reflection, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you may be disposed to agree with me that the patron saint whom I invoke has some peculiar warrant for presiding over a gathering like this, and that he has not been chosen merely to humor the racial idiosyncrasies of an unregenerate president.

Auspicious, you will grant, is Goethe's early and sincere interest in the institution whose guests we are on this occasion, an interest engendered through personal acquaintance with men of resonant New England names, like Everett, Ticknor, Cogswell, Bancroft, and graciously expressed in the dedication of a set of his writings in 1819 "to the library of the University of Cambridge in New England, as a mark of deep interest in its high literary character, and in the successful zeal it has displayed thro' so long a course of years for the promotion of solid and elegant education."

But granting that this is merely a casual though happy coincidence, let me remind you how fitly Goethe represents that living union of the ancient and the modern humanities which this meeting may be claimed to symbolize. A typically modern poet, Goethe remained a convinced admirer of ancient literature and art through all the vicissitudes of his long literary career, and the masterpieces of his ripe manhood are the noblest products of the classical renaissance in modern German literature.

To our Latin colleagues let me point out what Rome meant for the maturing of his art and for his happiness as a man. Many years after he had left the Eternal City, he could still exclaim:

Wandelt von jener Nacht mir das traurige Bild durch die Seele,
Welche die letzte für mich ward in der römischen Stadt;—
Wiederhol' ich die Nacht, wo des Teuren soviel mir zurückblieb,
Gleitet vom Auge noch jetzt mir eine Träne herab.

And oh, what comfort our Greek friends can find amid the chill blasts of modern indifference in the shelter of him for whom the ancient Greeks always remained those models to whom we moderns should ever return; not indeed to imitate them mechanically, but to be moved to like efforts in our sphere by the never failing inspiration of

Greek health and strength and beauty. "Every man be a Greek in his own way, but be one!" And as to those of us who are primarily students of modern life and letters, can we not safely entrust ourselves to Goethe with his strong sense of reality and of the present, who with undiminished interest and remarkable freedom from prejudice kept in touch to the last with all the significant cultural movements of his day? It is true, he often and eloquently expressed his deep sense of the continuity of all human knowledge and experience.

Wer nicht von dreitausend Jahren
Sich weiss Rechenschaft zu geben,
Bleib' im Dunkeln unerfahren,
Mag von Tag zu Tage leben.

And yet, at the reminiscent age of 80 years, he could still say with equal assurance and truth, "Only because men do not know how to appreciate and vivify the present, do they long so much for a better future or coquettishly ogle with the past."

Those among us who are devoting our labors to the study of Germanic culture claim him as our own in a deeper sense and see in him, in the words of Jacob Grimm, "the sun in the literary heavens of Germany." But the colleagues in the fields of English and of the Romance languages may none the less accept him as their spokesman with equal confidence. What foreigner ever proclaimed more enthusiastically the greatness of Shakespeare and of English literature, or more heartily acknowledged the cultural debt of gratitude that he owed to the classic poets of France? Not only his wide first-hand acquaintance with the languages and literatures of England, France, and Italy, but also his actual critical and exposi-

tory writings in these fields would, from a purely scholarly point of view, assure him a place of distinction among the ablest members of this Association. And were the Orientalists meeting with us, they would unquestionably be willing to do homage not only to the inspiration, but also to the learning of the poet of the *West-östlicher Divan*.

Not only as scholars, however, but also as teachers, we may be sure of finding our efforts appreciated at the hands of one who, despite his preëminently artistic endowment, found and nurtured a characteristic trait of didacticism in his own nature. More specifically, as teachers of foreign tongues we are indebted to him for that happy axiom so frequently quoted in support of our work, that he who has no knowledge of a foreign language does not know his own: "Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiss nichts von seiner eignen."

In fact, as teachers and as scholars, as philologists in the broader and in the narrower sense of the term, as representatives of ancient and of modern literature, as Anglists, Romanists and Germanists, as classicists, romantics and realists, we all can confidently enter the temple consecrated to the service of the patron saint whom I invoke. "Introite, nam et hic dii sunt."

In the brief time at my disposal, I cannot attempt to suggest all of the relations that might readily be established between characteristic views and utterances of Goethe and some of those manifold interests and problems that confront at the present time "the advancement of the Modern Languages and their Literatures," in constitutional parlance the object of the existence of our Association. Every one who knows fairly well not only the poet Goethe in his recognized "works," but also the man and thinker, as he has gradually become more and more

revealed through the rich treasures of his letters and conversations, every one so informed will be ready to admit that of such relations there exist a large number that suggest themselves easily and naturally. Some of them I have already referred to, or at least hinted at, as the advantage of the study of foreign languages, or the relative claims of the ancients and the moderns. Others might easily take us far afield into those general problems of education in which our own professional destinies are deeply involved, as, for instance, the latter-day invasion of the champions of the practical and utilitarian with its many reactions on the study of the humanities and chiefly perhaps of language and literature.

Instead, I propose to single out three important, broad and characteristic aspects of Goethe's view of life which had a profound bearing on his own work and development, which have proved very illuminating to me in dealing with the poet's complex and many-sided nature, and which permit of a ready and natural application to our own professional aims and conditions. If thus far I have laid the emphasis of my remarks upon Goethe himself as a source of light, I shall henceforth rather dwell upon those problems of ours that appear to be illumined by his light.

First, I desire to direct your attention to a group of thoughts suggested by the Goethean conception of *Weltliteratur*, which in his old age appeared to him as a matter of great moment and promise. Of course, in a sense, the facts underlying this idea are old, as far as it relates to a literary interchange between the leading nations of Europe, if not of the world. But what previously had been left to the play of chance or the stress of necessity was conceived by Goethe, who was justly aware

that he himself had become one of the great "Weltdichter," as a conscious movement growing out of new conditions of international life. According to his view, this movement should be fostered and guided, as on the other hand there are to be expected from it far-reaching results in the super-national life of the civilized world. Goethe's ideal must not be confused with that of the non-national cosmopolitanism of rationalistic thinkers of the 18th century. In their view the national differences separating the various peoples were in the main to be considered as hindrances to be reduced and eliminated as much as possible in the interest of a uniform and universally human ideal of life and culture. Goethe, however, developed and advocated his ideas after romanticism had successfully vindicated the deeper significance of the historical, racial, and popular elements in the life and thought of a nation. He is far from seeing in these tendencies mere hindrances to a speedy consummation of his hopes, but rather acknowledges them as characteristic factors of significant value and advantage. Just because nations, like individuals, are differently endowed and cannot escape the "daimon" that animates and controls them, they can aid each other toward a fuller conception and realization of human perfection. For this purpose, in the cultural traffic of nations, those tendencies should be strongly encouraged which point toward closer harmony and fuller appreciation; tolerance is to be insisted on where there are deep-seated and irreconcilable differences; and, lastly, those aspects of a nation's life in which it is strongest and most successful—what Goethe calls "die Vorzüge" of a given nation—are to be considered as worthy of special recognition. The following brief quotations may illustrate these assertions.

Truly universal tolerance is most securely established if we are not disturbed by the peculiarities of individuals or nations, but at the same time adhere to the conviction that everything truly meritorious is distinguished by being common to all mankind.

Only we repeat that we should not possibly expect that nations should think alike; but they should at least take notice of each other, comprehend each other, and if they cannot love each other, at least learn to bear with each other.

From the manner in which [foreigners] think of us, more or less favorably, we in turn learn to judge ourselves, and it cannot do any harm if for once we are made to reflect upon ourselves.

In the spirit of this conception Goethe was eager to do all that lay in his power to increase the nations' interest "an einer edlen allgemeinen Länder- und Weltannäherung." What he ultimately hoped for as at least one of the results of such mutual approach and appreciation is most clearly shown in a passage from a letter of Carlyle which he translated for his German fellow-countrymen with terms of highest approval:

Let nations, like individuals, but know one another and mutual hatred will give place to mutual helpfulness; and instead of natural enemies, as neighboring countries are sometimes called, we shall all be natural friends.

This noble thought, thus sanely pictured, neither suggests nor tolerates that puerile spirit of utopian recklessness which has done much to discredit the entire movement in the minds of many people who otherwise might well come under its spell and help serve its ends. In Goethe's

sober conception, the idea is entirely free from the blemish of an unruly and short-sighted disregard for the established laws of life. Results, he knows, will neither be sudden nor perfect, and he expressly warns his followers that they should not expect more than is reasonable.

Such a program of international appreciation, tolerance, and helpfulness has, it seems to me, a highly valuable significance for us modern language men who represent disciplines in the pursuit of which, no matter how objectively and judiciously we may proceed, the respective national points of view are bound to manifest themselves. This natural state of affairs is even further accentuated by the fact that in a large number of institutions, in our subjects far more than in others, and in this country far more than elsewhere, native Americans are working side by side with the representatives of other nationalities. The conditions of our profession thus offer an unusual opportunity for putting to the test, on a small scale, as it were, the Goethean principle "*einer edlen allgemeinen Länder- und Weltannäherung.*"

Pray do not fear that I have any intention of advocating that our Association as such recognize or support any of the specific movements now organized in this country and abroad in behalf of international conciliation and world peace. What I do desire to accomplish, however, thru these feeble words of mine is to aid in arousing among us as a profession a more general consciousness of the peculiar opportunities and responsibilities which apparently are ours in regard to a great world movement that has begun to fire the imagination and the will of many of the best minds of our age. We, above all, ought to have and undoubtedly do have that deeper knowledge that is claimed to be the warrant of appreciation and sympathy. But if so,

should we not remember that "no man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light?" Of course, I have no reference to the thoughtless use of high-sounding arguments such as you must have heard at teachers' meetings or seen in print in our popular proselyting literature, when the promotion of the peace of the world is conjured up as one of the reasons why John and Mary should not fail to elect German or French in their high school course, maybe in preference to Latin or Greek. But what has often seemed strange to me is that, to my knowledge, so very few of the scholars working in the field of the modern languages have been known to make their influence felt in a cause that is so peculiarly related to their specific work and interests.

An attitude of mind that would naturally emphasize the solidarity of our interests rather than those elements that tend to keep us apart would, moreover, have valuable results of a more immediate and practical nature nearer home. We all, the East no less, I understand, than the West, are keenly conscious of the change that is going on in regard to the value placed upon the study of foreign language in the national scheme of education. We are under fire from almost all sides, and if the most peremptory of up-to-date reformers could have their way, language and literature would promptly be removed from the essentials of the new education, if not altogether excluded. It is evident that under such circumstances the strength of our position will be greatly augmented by all that makes for harmony and mutual helpfulness within the fold; while everything that fosters dissension and jealousy and extreme rivalry cannot but reduce our prospects. United we surely stand more firmly, divided we shall certainly fall more easily.

In making these suggestions, I am primarily thinking of our own Association. But as this is a joint meeting of the classical and of the modern language groups, I feel justified in laying especial stress on the fact that in this respect, if in no other, all the language interests form a community the individual members of which are closely dependent on one another. The more indifferent the purchasing public becomes to the wares we have to offer, the more solicitous some of us are likely to grow in our efforts to retain old customers or to find new ones, either overpraising our own goods or calling in question the quality of those of our rivals. Of course, fair and frank competition is inevitable and, within limits, desirable and necessary. We all believe or should believe in the value, even the superior value, of the subject in which our work primarily lies. But we should aim to make our claims, whether in theory or in practice, in public or in private, on the positive side of what our subjects legitimately have to offer and avoid all wilful disparagement of the characteristic values of rival claimants. Differences of opinion need not be glossed over, convictions must be expressed, preferences plainly stated. But none the less we should be able to convey the sincere impression that back of it all we are animated by good will for those who work in another field, by interest in their success, respect for their labors. Let us be assured that a public and a student body, prone as they are to linguistic and literary scepticism, will only too readily assent to and be influenced by whatever we urge against a competitor and, no doubt, will soon find or make an occasion for again quoting it garnished to taste, as coming from those who ought to be in a position to know. So far so good. But do not forget that the claims which we may make in support of our own subjects will be riddled

by similar counter-arguments which our colleagues may have leveled against us on other occasions. To quote an instance that has recently come to my notice, it certainly should not be necessary that the just claims for the high value of Latin training in the schools should assume the form of an uncalled for and reckless attack upon German because it is, at least with us in the West, "that most serious competitor of Latin in secondary schools." And matters are, of course, not improved, but only rendered worse, if it be pointed out that equally ill-considered and damaging statements against the classics emanate from the representatives of the modern tongues.

I think we are ready to admit that the cause of language was not advanced in any true sense thru the acrimonious charges and counter-charges which flew thru the air not so many years ago when the conflict was waging over the introduction of the modern languages into the traditional curricula of schools and colleges. What was unwise then would, however, be suicidal today, when the attack is from without. Only the common enemy is deriving advantage from any ammunition we may use against one another.

I plead, then, both in the interest of a great world movement and in the interest of our undivided attention upon the common cause of linguistic and literary culture, for the maximum of unity of effort, of mutual appreciation, of whole-souled emphasis on what unites us as co-workers and not on what separates us in regard to minor matters of aim and method or of a characteristically national point of view. It may be that this warning is unnecessary. Nobody would be happier than myself if I could be shown to be mistaken. But I admit that it has seemed to me as though of late there were a tendency gaining ground, not

only in matters of mere language instruction, but also in regard to the higher cultural values represented by the various literatures which we represent, that could not be claimed to be in harmony with the Goethean conception of *Weltliteratur* and that does not augur well for the most successful defense of our present endangered position.

In Goethe's ideal of *Weltliteratur*, and even more strikingly in some of the other attitudes and opinions of his already alluded to, we find recurrent an underlying principle which I have selected as the second matter to bring to your attention. Be a Greek and be a German, be an artist and be a teacher, prize the present and honor tradition, rely on personality and esteem foreign achievement—formulas like these reveal a mode of thought that seeks the secret of health and beauty and greatness in a harmonious synthesis of conflicting tendencies, an idea charmingly applied to Goethe himself in those two little characteristic lines:

Bin Weltbewohner,
Bin Weimaraner.

And indeed we are touching here upon one of the most vital and fertile of the more fundamental concepts of Goethe's philosophy of life. All growth and development, in fact, all life, physical, intellectual, and spiritual, is viewed by him as a constant fluctuation between opposites which are equally necessary for the maintenance of the evolutionary process. This perpetual flux and reflux appears to him as by no means void of meaning or consistency. He firmly believes in positive progress, in a real upward or forward tendency, and bases his assurance on the observation, made in nature and in human life, that, in the last analysis, a development in a given direction is benefited by

the succeeding rebound in the opposite direction. It is corrected and enriched by it, and the entire process is thus lifted, as it were, to a new and higher level. In this sense the life of the entire universe in its dynamic evolution is symbolized by Goethe now as the interaction of attracting and repelling magnetic poles, now as a pulsating process in which systole and diastole, contraction and dilation, follow upon each other with rhythmic regularity. In either case syntheses between opposites lead gradually to ever new and ever more refined forms of development.

A few brief quotations may again illustrate this principle, which in all guises and disguises occurs again and again in many of Goethe's conceptions and utterances.

Polarität und Steigerung, die zwei grossen Trieb-
räder aller Natur.

People say that half-way between two conflicting opinions lies truth. By no means! It is the problem that lies there . . . eternally dynamic life imagined only as tho at rest.

A century that relies entirely upon analysis and is afraid, as it were, of synthesis is not on the right track. Only the two together, like exhalation and inhalation, constitute the life of science.

During my entire life I had proceeded now as poet and now as observer, now synthetically and then again analytically. The systole and diastole of the human spirit, as tho a second breathing, were with me never separate, always pulsating.

This doctrine of opposites as one of the basic principles of life, no less in the most complex cosmic processes than in the minutest problems of individual existence, is, of course, not of Goethe's invention. In some form or other it is as old as the history of human speculation, and

philosophers trace it far beyond the Platonic system to Heraclitus or even to doctrines of earliest oriental meditation. What gives us a right to consider it as a characteristically Goethean principle is the frequency and intensity with which he insists on it and the illuminating power which it assumes if applied to Goethe's own contradictory and yet harmonious personality.

Viewed in the light of such a theory, that which we conceive as rest, both in the moral and in the physical world, is not rest at all, but rather a temporary state of tension or balance, resulting from the equalizing influence of two opposite forces. The solution of any problem of life is therefore not to be sought at either extreme, nor indeed at some comfortable "dead" point representing a definitive and permanent adjustment. As far as any "solution" is possible at all, it is to be found in the vigilant maintenance of a relative balance amid the constant shifts of conflicting tendencies, which in themselves are equally true and equally false.

Permit me to apply this theory for a few moments to the work of an association as complex as the one whose welfare depends on us. We are all aware that within its limits there exists a wealth of different and maybe antagonistic tendencies, all of which we are bound to consider necessary for the welfare of the whole: the classic and the romantic, the medieval and the modern, the Germanic and Romance, literature and "philology," culture and learning, teaching and research. What a fruitful field for discussion and debate! At every turn live problems which will never permit of static solution, except perchance in the abstract reasoning of speculation.

Nur der verdient sich Freiheit wie das Leben,
Der täglich sie erobern muss.

From these conflicting interests I desire to single out for brief consideration one phase of the much-discussed problem of the relation of teaching and research. And in speaking on this question I trust I may be pardoned if I repeat some statements which I made several years ago in an address as chairman of the Central Division of our Association. I considered the issue an unsolved problem then, as far as the activities of our Association are concerned, simply because no trace of balance existed between conflicting claims of approximately equal weight and dignity. For the same reason I must consider it an unsolved problem now. At the same time I feel convinced that a fairly thoroughgoing attempt at a more equitable settlement cannot safely be put off very much longer. Unfortunately, I myself am far less sure than I thought I was several years ago as to the best method of securing improvement. I only feel more convinced than ever that the present situation is an anomaly which we cannot continue to countenance with equanimity.

A brief historical retrospect will help to justify my conviction that our profession should no longer delay making strong and liberal provision, in some form or other, for the pedagogical and broadly cultural interests of our work in addition to those in pure scholarship and research.

The first volume of our *Publications* of the year 1884-5, out of a total of 17 printed papers, contained as many as nine, over one-half, of a general and in the main pedagogical character. Thus we clearly see to what extent the teaching interests were then overshadowing the ideal of research. Soon, however, the pendulum began to swing in the opposite direction; systole followed upon diastole. After the first three volumes, not more than one or two papers of a general or pedagogical character ap-

peared each year, until finally, in the seventh volume, that of 1892, there is not a single paper printed that deals directly with the teaching problems of our profession. Since then, aside from some of the presidential addresses that have dealt with such questions, scarcely a single non-technical article seems to have been printed as a regular part of the *Publications* of our Association. A so-called "Pedagogical Section" which at least in name had kept up the older tradition, ceased to exist about 1902, and in the same year the presidential address frankly proclaimed that the object of this Association, as phrased in the third section of the Constitution, should be interpreted as: "the advancement of philology in the departments of the modern languages." This meant, of course, that in our Association, as far at least as its official character and, above all, its publications were concerned, the older college ideal had been entirely superseded by the modern university ideal, chiefly that of the graduate school, as it had developed in our strongest institutions; and these—as was natural and proper—have been the acknowledged leaders in the policy of the Association.

Most of us, I feel sure, rejoice heartily in this ascendancy and final victory of scholarship, and we can easily imagine how much, in the early history of the Association, the repression of narrowly and superficially pedagogical interests was needed. We feel deeply grateful to those who, in this struggle for supremacy, held high the banner of learning and ultimately won the day. The legitimate question now, however, seems to be whether the swing of the pendulum has not carried us too far toward the opposite pole. With our present strength as a strictly scholarly body assured, should we not be ready to recognize that it behooves us to give more attention and en-

couragement than we do now to the broader educational and practical interests of our profession? Has the ideal of productive scholarship in all these years taken root so little that we must fear it will suffer and die unless we keep it surrounded by the high walls of a protective tariff? The exclusiveness which once, no doubt, was the part of wisdom and has helped to make us strong is now the part either of superciliousness or of timidity and impairs the fullness of the influence which we might wield.

When I speak of important educational problems that require recognition at the hands of the leaders of our profession, I am far from thinking primarily of the well-worn, though in its place important question of sound methods of elementary language teaching. Very different subjects claim our attention with at least equal force; as, for instance, the broad and complex problem of the exact function of the modern languages and literatures in the general intellectual and cultural training of our American undergraduates and all that results from clearness on this point; or the question of the proper university training for prospective secondary and college teachers of modern languages, a question which, in turn, involves the scrutiny of the character and sequence of the work constituting a "major" for the degrees of bachelor or master of arts and, in a measure, even for the doctor's degree. And there are many other problems of similar weight and difficulty that call for consideration and solution.

The seriousness of the situation is even greater than might appear at first sight. Had we journals of high standing specifically devoted to the interests and problems of modern language instruction, then indeed interested members might make good thru their individual efforts what we leave undone as an association at our meetings

and in our publications. But this is not the case. Every European country has one or more such publications. We in this country possess practically nothing of the kind for the modern foreign languages,¹ even tho we have a fairly large number of journals and of other serial publications exclusively devoted to the interests of research—a situation which corresponds neither to the actual conditions nor to the real needs of our profession. Our classical colleagues, with more sincerity and wisdom, have recognized the need of a publication of a more practical character. They have thereby not jeopardized their legitimate interests in research while they have greatly enhanced both the thoroness and effectiveness of their school and college teaching and the all-important feeling of a real solidarity all along the line. A similar venture has been made for English, it is true. But I for one must regret that it does not represent a closer connection with the spirit and membership of our Association.

This suggests the trend, however, which things are bound to take if we do not bestir ourselves. If even the most solid and important educational problems of our profession are to remain practically eliminated from our

¹ The *Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik*, excellent service tho it has rendered in the otherwise unoccupied field, has, for various reasons, never become a journal of general appeal to secondary and college teachers. Some of the most important contributions on modern language instruction have been published of late years in *The Educational Review*, *The School Review*, *Science*, and other journals of a general character in which they are in danger of being overlooked by the profession. We have, moreover, no channel of communication whatsoever for those minor matters of information which men working together in a professional brotherhood should have of each other, as for instance, significant new appointments, new foundations of chairs, or libraries, or seminaries, important changes in the requirements for degrees, and so forth.

meetings and publications, these interests must either be transferred to other organizations already in existence or they must find expression in new organizations of their own. Should the Association, after careful consideration of all matters involved, desire to remain a research society pure and simple, as learned societies rightfully may be, such a result need not dismay us. If, however, we desire to be recognized as leaders in all legitimate questions concerning the scholarly teaching of our subjects, we cannot view idly the growing estrangement and dissatisfaction of an important element of our profession.

I myself, as I have already indicated, have no remedy to propose. But what I think we owe to ourselves is a frank recognition of the existing unsatisfactory situation, a searching diagnosis of the case with the aid of the best expert advice available, and a firm resolve to do squarely whatever the situation may seem to require. It will not do for us to shirk our responsibility toward the more immediate teaching interests, remote as they may be from the personal work of many of the leaders of the Association, by claiming that we are not our brother's keeper. The best talent and most vigorous life of our profession have been gathered together by us in our body and—*noblesse oblige*.

If we decide to remain what we are, we should make it clear to those of our colleagues who feel that their pedagogical interests require organization, that we would not stand in the way of any attempt of theirs to solve their problems through some organized form of their own, but that on the contrary we wish them Godspeed and are willing to render them all possible assistance. In that case we might lose a few members, though surely not many; whereas we should gain in homogeneity of temper and aspiration.

If, on the other hand, we prefer to enlarge our sphere, we should from the start face the fact that no half-hearted measure will do. We must not attempt to put off the discontented a few years longer by throwing them a sop. A lamely revived pedagogical section for instance, with the right to get into a corner by itself and talk, will never do. Nothing but a pretty thoroughgoing reorganization could accomplish the purpose. For what the teaching interests in my opinion need above all is a journal, a channel of expression and communication that should be both scholarly and practical, and cost considerably less than the *Publications* of the Association. As regards annual meetings, I consider it exceedingly doubtful whether national conventions could ever be made to bring together a representative number of high school teachers or teachers of small colleges and normal schools for the purpose of discussing professional questions. Such an effort would no doubt be doomed to failure unless it were integrally connected with national monster meetings of a general character like those of the National Education Association. But the distracting atmosphere of such heterogeneous gatherings is anything but advantageous to the thoughtful and patient discussion of detailed problems interesting only to the specialist.

But whether the teaching interests find the needed recognition and organization inside of the Association or outside of it, in either case the balance which now is lacking would be restored. For from the standpoint of the general interests of the profession it does not matter whether that balance be adjusted between our Association and some outside organization or between two equally vigorous and active divisions within the Association. What does matter in the light of Goethean thought is the frank recognition

of the problem that lies half-way between the two conflicting opinions, and of the fact that only synthesis and analysis together, like inhalation and exhalation, constitute the healthy life of a science.

Some such adjustment of the present unsatisfactory condition I should claim to be highly desirable under any circumstances. It becomes an absolute necessity under those peculiar difficulties to which I have already alluded and from which our interests are suffering at this time. Teachers of foreign languages are at present constantly exposed to criticisms of and attacks upon their work, even tho such criticisms may in no way be aimed at their individual fitness or service, but leveled at the subjects themselves which they represent. And in this hour of stress and need, our teachers have neither a journal, nor an organization of generally recognized prestige to which they can look for information and guidance. They lack entirely the sustaining consciousness of a corporate body back of them. That is a grievous tactical error, and we must blame ourselves if we cannot hold our own as well as we could if better organized and disciplined.

This brings me to my third and last point—the present general situation in education and the outlook for the future. In this connection also I hope to find light in some characteristic views of Goethe. Pardon me if I appear to treat with undue brevity a subject as intricate and perplexing as it is significant and worthy of careful analysis. But I feel that I ought not to tax your patience much longer. Besides, my immediate predecessor in office has ably and fully discussed this question in his recent address on “The Dark Ages,” which, no doubt, is still fresh in the minds of most of you. It is with hesi-

tation, therefore, that I beg leave to differ from him in some measure, though not in regard to the facts which he described, nor in regard to the strictures he made. They were correct and just. His aim was to point out the deep and gloomy shadows that are in the picture and that are indeed disheartening. And he did it vigorously and convincingly. But if he held a brief for revealing darkness I, on the contrary, hold a brief for finding light. For does not the evolutionary theory of my spiritual guide bid me look for light even in the darkness, or at least expect that darkness must again be followed by light?

Verily, few great men of modern times are exponents of so contagious a spirit of refined optimism in regard to life in its totality, in its essential goodness and promise, as Goethe. This note of hopefulness and of confidence characterizes almost everything said and done by Goethe in the years of his maturity and, even more, of his old age. I again quote a few passages chosen almost at random.

‘Nein, heut ist mir das Glück erbost!’
Du saddle gut und reite getrost.

At times our fortune looks like a fruit tree in winter. Who, at its sorry sight, would believe that these rigid branches and jagged twigs could burst into leaf and blossom in the coming Spring and then bear fruit! And yet we hope for it, we know it.

Even tho error should gain control in a science, truth will always retain a minority; and should this minority dwindle down to one single mind, there would still be no reason for alarm. This one mind will continue in his quiet and secluded work and influence, and a time will come when people will take an interest in him and his convictions and, as light begins to spread more generally, his convictions will again be able to venture into the open.

But tho an optimist, Goethe cannot be said to have taken life lightly. On the contrary, it appeared eminently serious to him; so serious that he confessed he could not understand how humor, a faculty which was by no means lacking in him, could ever with a thoughtful critic of life be more than an incidental touch in a portrayal of human affairs. Goethe, as he himself said, had inherited from his father not only his bodily frame, but also "*des Lebens ernstes Führen.*" Nor did Goethe consider himself personally the pet child of fortune that many persist in seeing in him. He knew too well how intensely he had been compelled to struggle for all the real prizes which he had won from life. These prizes he saw in things inward and spiritual which are not to be measured in terms of financial comfort, material success, and physical well-being. In fact, Goethe had gradually learned not to expect too much of life and to practice that art of wise resignation which keeps as free from quietistic self-effacement as from the rankling bitterness of disappointment, and gratefully and joyously aims to fix the eye upon those things of life that are good and helpful.

In this spirit, then, I beg leave to express my convictions. The present educational situation unquestionably has in it many disquieting elements. Some of these are deplorable from whatever angle we view them; others, though hurtful, impress us as being due to temporary conditions of transition and no doubt will readjust themselves as soon as a new equilibrium has been found. But I see still other elements which clearly seem to have in them the promise of real progress, and which in the broadest interest of human development need and deserve our support, even tho they may point to a different conception of wisdom and of culture from that in which most of us of the older generation have grown up.

Deplorable under all circumstances is the spirit of superficiality and of narrow utilitarianism which has invaded the realm of education on all sides, spreading confusion of trade with life, of efficiency with wisdom, of success with happiness, of narrowly vocational training with real education. Not that vocational training is negligible; but its *substitution* for education, not only in practice, which is bad enough, but even in theory, which is worse, is baneful and must carry in its wake the worst errors and delusions.

Bad, tho in all likelihood of only transitory prominence, are those elements which result from the sudden expansion in educational affairs that we are witnessing. In consequence of the far-reaching social and economic changes that are going on in this as in all modern countries, large numbers of individuals and entire strata of society are drawn into those channels of higher education which were formerly reserved for smaller and more select groups. The result is on the one hand a spirit of instability and adventurousness that prefers the new simply because it is new; on the other hand a spirit of externalism that worships size and numbers, budgets and plants, mechanical efficiency and administrative availability as tho they were in themselves indications of cultural growth and spiritual power.

These tendencies we should likewise discountenance, in high places and in low places, in ourselves—for few of us remain immune—no less than in others. But let us not forget that historically we *are* committed to the policy of a national life on democratic lines, even tho not in the sense in which the man in the street conceives the idea. Let us not forget that ultimate success in this tremendous experiment becomes visionary as soon as the best minds of the nation do not identify themselves with it;

as soon as they assume beforehand that our greatest national hope, our noblest contribution to the large ideals of mankind, is bound to end in defeat instead of leading to new heights of achievement. Let us hope that a true spirit of learning and wisdom and culture can be kept sufficiently active and alive in our higher educational institutions, so that when its hour returns, and be confident with Goethe that it will return, it may be able to draw into its circle of influence far larger elements of society than was possible under the old order.

So much, however, seems certain; this future ideal of culture in whose ultimate reign we must believe unless we are willing to give up all hope of true progress, will not be merely a return to the older one we have cherished for generations. The Goethean conception of the periodicity of life, as I have said before, would be void of deeper meaning, did it not include the promise of an absolute advance. The interplay of action and reaction to him involved the principle of an ever renewed synthesis between the conflicting opposites, whereby life and its ideals are to be lifted to ever higher levels of content and meaning.

For the uncompromising traditionalists among us, who can see true progress only in a return to the cherished position that was once their own, this view of the trend of things contains but little comfort, I fear. In fact, I see the real promise of growth in a direction in which I should not be surprised to learn that many of my more immediate colleagues see nothing but danger—in the rich and growing development of an ever deeper study of the natural sciences. Superficially viewed, to be sure, they seem to be the arch-enemies of humanistic culture as represented in the disciplines of language and literature, of history and philosophy. No doubt, they have largely usurped the place formerly held in the estimation of the

public and in our college curricula by the older humanistic subjects. But usurpation of a place formerly held by another good occupant is in itself no ground for arraignment, either in education, or in life in general. Otherwise, how should we modern language men feel in the presence of our esteemed colleagues of the ancient classical dispensation?

As long as science is studied and taught solely as 'pure' theory or as 'applied' practice, it cannot claim to aspire to recognition of a more broadly cultural character. But thoughtful scientists who are not only scholarly investigators or practical men of applied science, but who are also broad-minded educators and believers in the spiritual values of human culture, have long begun to scan their field of study from a subtler point of view. The technical study of the humanities is not identical with humanistic culture, but it is an indispensable aid toward preparing the ground for it and rendering it more generally accessible. Similarly, modern scientists seem to ask themselves whether the theoretic study of nature and her facts and laws cannot likewise be made to unlock ultimately new elements of true culture? The question is far too difficult for me to do more than suggest it. Suffice to say that among modern men of science there are convinced advocates of human culture, who by no means confuse culture with mere skill or knowledge and yet answer this question in the affirmative. They have begun to search nature, not nature in its practical applications, nor nature in its picturesque or so-called emotional aspects, but nature in its strictly scientific principles, for esthetic and moral elements of culture and wisdom, and I believe not in vain.

Scientific men of such temper and aspirations I know are as yet in a small minority, and the wisdom and cul-

ture they are looking for in science is only dimly foreseen by them as a far away beckoning goal. The question for us, however, is the attitude we should assume toward such strivings. Should it be one of self-sufficient disdain or of appreciative sympathy?

If the representatives of language and literature consider themselves, in the educational world, as the traditional guardians of humanistic culture, they are under obligation to give serious consideration to every thoughtful movement on behalf of a hoped-for enrichment and enlargement of this culture. Apodictic judgments of *a priori* condemnation might bespeak more egotism than insight. Man will no doubt always remain the center of man's cultural interests. But to future generations man's relation to nature is certain to appear in a very different light from that in which it has long been viewed by either a transcendental or an exclusively rationalistic interpretation of human life. As our knowledge grows deeper and broader, "Law for man, and law for thing" may indeed be seen to have more in common than many of us are now willing to admit. Out of the discipline of science may come, not a substitute for humanism, heaven forbid, but perhaps a significant enrichment of humanism. I hope it may come through that synthesis of component opposites, which Goethean theory leads us to look and hope for.

And is not Goethe himself a striking symbolization of the development toward which humanistic culture seems to be tending? If advocates of the cultural possibilities dormant in science voice their regret that modern science has as yet inspired no poet, I think I may well point to Goethe, the poet-scientist, who, in this as in many other respects, seems to have been far in advance of his age. It would be an engaging task to examine in detail how

much of his art and of his spiritual personality Goethe owed, not only to his deep and sincere love of nature, wherein many another poet resembles him, but even more to those strictly scientific interests in nature in which he virtually stands alone among the sons of Apollo. To mention but one instance, who would not admit that in a poem like "Die Metamorphose der Pflanzen" modern science has indeed inspired true and noble poetry—not didacticism in verse, but genuine poetry of a deeply human appeal and significance? If most critics still deplore the years which they think Goethe wasted on his scientific studies, the time may be nearer than we think when men will marvel at such a short-sighted lack of comprehension. Then perhaps one of Goethe's chief claims to greatness as a representative of modern culture may be seen in the fact that as a humanist and poet he accepted science and made his scientific wisdom contribute to a truer and larger and richer conception of man in nature and of nature in man.

Let me quote at least one passage from those words in which the old Goethe himself referred to the inability of his contemporaries to understand the union of poet and scientist in him. They sound like a prophecy of what the future may bring us.

On all sides people refused to admit that science and poetry could be united. They forgot that science had developed from poetry; they failed to consider that after a cycle of generations (*nach einem Umschwung von Zeiten*) both might easily meet again on a higher level in a friendly spirit and to mutual advantage.

How far away this time is, who would venture to say? When it comes, when science thru more and more of its representatives shall seek to establish connections with

humanistic culture in the effort to evolve a new interpretation of man's nature and history and aspirations, I hope we of the older humanities may be ready to meet the movement critically, but not without sympathy and understanding, as Goethe, the humanist, would no doubt meet it, if he were among us; and not only we of the modern field, but also our classical colleagues. For it is not unlikely that a deepened interest in the classics will arise under the sway of such a new dispensation. The ancients, tho naïvely and by instinct, were truer disciples of nature than we moderns have often been.

As advocates of learning and culture, let us then not lose hope and courage. Let us stand together in helpful sympathy and coöperation; let us minister faithfully and liberally to all the various needs of the work committed to us; let us meet with appreciation those who, from a different point of view, may aim at the same lofty goal toward which there are many avenues of approach. The luck of the day and of the hour, I admit, is not with us, but light may come sooner than we think. And thus I close with the Goethean message of determination and good cheer conveyed in the simple couplet quoted before:

‘Nein, heut ist mir das Glück erbost!’
Du sattle gut und reite getrost!
